



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,590	03/18/2004	Folu Okunseinde	AUS920031041US1	7383

46240 7590 09/11/2008

IBM CORPORATION (WMA)  
C/O WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.  
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100  
HOUSTON, TX 77042

EXAMINER

GERGISO, TECHANE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/803,590

**Applicant(s)**

OKUNSEINDE ET AL.

**Examiner**

TECHANE J. GERGISO

**Art Unit**

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/11/2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 28-30 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/18/2004/07/11/2008  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is a Final Office Action in response to the applicant's communication filed on July 11, 2008.
2. Claims 1-9 and 28-30 have been examined and are pending.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 11, 2008, February 25, 2008 and March 18, 2004 have been considered by the examiner.

#### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 28 and 29 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 1: lines 3, 6; claim 2: lines 2, 5; claim 6: line 2; claim 9: line 4; claim 14: line 3; claim 28: lines 5, 8; and claim 29: line 2 recites "**remote device is capable of providing....**". The claims do **not** recite a **define action of "remote device is providing "** and instead they suggest that what the remote device is "**capable of**" and it renders the claims ambiguous to distinguish what the remote device is capable of and not capable of. **The applicant argues that** Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 28-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In furthermore, the applicant argue that "It is respectfully submitted that Applicants are not claiming a device capable of providing a level of security, rather Applicants are claiming a method wherein certain claimed features determine if a remote device is capable of providing a level of security. As such, Applicants respectfully request the claim objections be withdrawn". The examiner disagrees with the applicant's because the applicant is actually claiming that if the adjacent intermediate device is **capable** of providing the level of security, then transmits the object to the adjacent intermediate and therefore, the examiner gave patentable weight to "**capable of**" and found ambiguous it to define boundary and scope of the claims as explained above. Therefore, the applicant's argument is not persuasive to overcome the rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler et al. (hereinafter referred to as Kaler, US Pub No.: 2004/0139322 A1) in view of Shewchuk et al. (hereinafter referred to as Shewchuk, US Pub, No.: 2004/0139352).

8. transactions wherein the object is to be transmitted from a source device to a target device along a transmission .path that includes at least one intermediate device;

As per claim 1:

Kaler discloses a method, comprising:

determining security information associated with at least one object of transactions

wherein the object is to be transmitted from a source device to a target device

along a transmission .path that includes at least one intermediate device (0049);

determining if an adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path is capable of

providing a level of security (0029); and

transmitting the object to the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path in

response to determining that the adjacent intermediate device is capable of

providing the level of security (0110; 0119).

Kaler does not explicitly disclose providing a level of security indicated by at least a portion of the security information. Shewchuk, in analogous art, however, disclose providing a level of security indicated by at least a portion of the security information (0014; 0017; 0043; 0065; 0069; 0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Kaler to include determining an alternative remote device that is capable of providing the level of security represented in response to determining that the remote device is not capable of providing the level of security. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to do to provide a uniformly representing and transferring security assertion and security response information as suggested by Shewchuk (0014-0015).

As per claim 2:

Kaler discloses a method, wherein the object is a business object, and wherein determining if the remote device is capable of providing the level of security comprises:

transmitting to the adjacent intermediate device the transmission path information representative of the level of security that is desired (0049); and  
receiving a response from the adjacent intermediate device the transmission path indicating that the adjacent intermediate device the transmission path is capable of providing the desired level of security (0110; 0119).

As per claim 3:

Kaler discloses a method, wherein determining the security information comprises accessing a header portion of the object (0078; 0079; 0081).

wherein determining, if an adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path is capable of providing a level of security indicated comprises performing at least one of (0016; 0030; 0081, 0110):

transmitting information representative of the level of security that is desired to the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path prompts the intermediate device in the device in the transmission path to execute at least one module that

allows the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path to provide the level of security (0016; 0030; 0081, 0110); and  
comparing the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path to a list of trusted devices in the header portion of the object (0016; 0030; 0081, 0110);  
wherein transmitting the object to the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path comprises transmitting the object to an object handler module in the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path (0039; 0052; 0067);  
wherein the object handler module is a business integration adapter supporting connectivity options, the connectivity options comprising at least one of packaged applications, custom applications, legacy applications, databases, trading partners' system, and public information stores on the internet (0039; 0052; 0067);  
wherein the object handler module supports at least one of event-driven real-time synchronous connections, asynchronous loosely coupled connections with trading partners, synchronous on-demand connections to customers and synchronous tightly coupled connections to trusted trading partners (0039; 0052; 0067).

As per claim 4:

Kaler discloses a method, wherein determining the security information comprises determining security information relating to at least one of connection information, class information, trusted entities information, and logging capability information (0010; 0043).

As per claim 5:

Kaler discloses a method, wherein accessing the header portion of the object comprises accessing at least one header of a Simple Object Access Protocol message (0080; 0081; 0095).

As per claim 6:

Shewchuk disclose determining an alternative intermediate device along a different transmission path that is capable of providing the level of security represented in response to determining that the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path is not capable of providing the level of security (Figure 5: Validating message processor; 531; 0115-0116).

As per claim 7:

Kaler discloses a method, article and apparatus, comprising causing sending a message to the adjacent intermediate device in the transmission path instructing the adjacent intermediate device to execute at least one module that allows the remote device to provide the level of security (0086).

As per claim 8:

Kaler discloses a method, article and apparatus, wherein determining the security information comprises determining the security information in response to receiving the object from a remote device (0033).

As per claim 28:

Kaler discloses a method, comprising:



receiving, at a first device, a request from a second device desiring to transmit at least one object, wherein the request (0049; Figure 5: 534; 546);  
determining if the first device is capable of providing a level of security represented by the security parameter (0029; Figure 5: 534; 546); and  
transmitting an indication to the second device based on determining if the first device is capable of providing the level of security (0110; 0119).

Kaler does not explicitly disclose a portion of security information associated with the object. Shewchuk, in analogous art, however, disclose a portion of security information associated with the object (0014; 0017; 0043; 0065; 0069; 0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Kaler to include a portion of security information associated with the object. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do to provide a uniformly representing and transferring security assertion and security response information as suggested by Shewchuk (0014-0015).

As per claim 29:

Kaler discloses a method, where configuring the first device with at least one module that allows the first device the capability of providing the level of security (Figure 3: 300; 312).

As per claim 30:

Kaler discloses a method, where receiving the data object from the second device.  
(Figure 3: 311)

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the notice of reference cited in form PTO-892 for additional prior art.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tachane J. Gergiso whose telephone number is (571) 272-3784

Art Unit: 2137

and fax number is (571) 273-3784. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/T. J. G./

Examiner, Art Unit 2137

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137